

Sussex Research Online

Observational cohort study to determine the degree and causes of variation in the rate of surgery or primary endocrine therapy in older women with operable breast cancer

Article (Accepted Version)

Morgan, Jenna L, Holmes, Geoff, Ward, Sue, Martin, Charlene, Burton, Maria, Walters, Stephen J, Cheung, Kwok Leung, Audisio, Riccardo A, Reed, Malcolm W R and Wyld, Lynda (2020) Observational cohort study to determine the degree and causes of variation in the rate of surgery or primary endocrine therapy in older women with operable breast cancer. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. ISSN 0748-7983

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/93922/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

For Re-submission to European Journal of Surgical Oncology

Title: Observational cohort study to determine the degree and causes of variation in the rate of surgery or primary endocrine therapy in older women with operable breast cancer.

Authors:

Jenna L Morgan¹, Geoff Holmes², Sue Ward², Charlene Martin¹, Maria Burton³, Stephen J Walters⁴, Kwok Leung Cheung⁵, Riccardo A Audisio⁶, Malcolm WR Reed⁷, Lynda Wyld¹ on behalf of the Bridging the Age Gap Trial Management Team*

*See Appendix for full list.

Author affiliations:

1. Academic Unit of Surgical Oncology, University of Sheffield Medical School, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield, UK.
2. Department of Health Economics and Decision Science, School for Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.
3. Centre for Health and Social Care Research, Sheffield Hallam University, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield, UK.
4. Clinical Trials Research Unit, School for Health and Related Research, SchARR, University of Sheffield.
5. University of Nottingham, Royal Derby Hospital, Uttoxeter Road, Derby, DE22 3DT.
6. University of Gothenberg, Sahlgrenska Universitetssjukhuset, 41345 Göteborg, Sweden.
7. Brighton and Sussex Medical School, Brighton, UK.

Corresponding author: Miss Jenna Morgan, Department of Surgical Oncology and Metabolism, University of Sheffield Medical School, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield, S10 2JF, UK. Email:

j.morgan@sheffield.ac.uk Tel: +44 (0)114 271 3611. Fax: +44 (0)114 271 3314.

Funding:

This paper presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) under its Programme Grants for Applied Research Programme (Grant Reference Number RP-PG-1209-10071). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Article type: Original article.

Previous communication to a society or meeting: Some data were submitted and accepted for presentation to European Breast Cancer Conference March 2020 (Barcelona) and Association of Breast Surgery Conference June 2020 (Bournemouth), although both conferences were subsequently cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Disclosures: The authors declare no conflict of interest. Professor Stephen Walters is a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Senior Investigator and Jenna Morgan is a NIHR Clinical Lecturer.

Key words: Breast cancer, elderly, primary endocrine therapy, surgery, treatment variation.

Abstract:**Background**

In the UK there is variation in the treatment of older women with breast cancer, with up to 40% receiving primary endocrine therapy (PET), which is associated with inferior survival. Case mix and patient choice may explain some variation in practice but clinician preference may also be important.

Methods

A multicentre prospective cohort study of women aged >70 with operable breast cancer. Patient characteristics (health status, age, tumour characteristics, treatment allocation and decision-making preference) were analysed to identify whether treatment variation persisted following case-mix adjustment. Expected case-mix adjusted surgery rates were derived by logistic regression using the variables age, co-morbidity, tumour stage and grade. Concordance between patients' preferred and actual decision-making style was assessed and associations between age, treatment and decision-making style calculated.

Results

Women (median age 77, range 70-102) were recruited from 56 UK breast units between 2013 and 2018. Of 2854/3369 eligible women with oestrogen receptor positive breast cancer, 2354 were treated with surgery and 500 with PET. Unadjusted surgery rates varied between hospitals, with 23/56 units falling outside the 95% confidence intervals on funnel plots. Adjusting for case mix reduced, but did not eliminate, this variation between hospitals (10/56 units had practice outside the 95% confidence intervals). Patients treated with PET had more patient-centred decisions compared to surgical patients (42.2% vs 28.4%, $p<0.001$).

Conclusions

This study demonstrates variation in treatment selection thresholds for older women with breast cancer. Health stratified guidelines on thresholds for PET would help reduce variation, although patient preference should still be respected.

Introduction.

Older women (>70 years) account for more than a third of new breast cancer diagnoses in the UK and have poorer outcomes compared to younger women, with later stage at presentation and higher rates of non-standard treatment (1-4). One such treatment is Primary Endocrine Therapy (PET), where surgery is omitted in favour of endocrine therapy alone to treat women with oestrogen receptor positive (ER+) breast cancer. A Cochrane review comparing PET with surgery in the over 70s demonstrated superior rates of local control with surgery but no difference in five year overall survival rates (5). However the included studies were flawed by modern standards as some included women with ER negative disease and some also included younger, healthy women. More recent studies have advocated the use of PET only in the very old or frail (6) and current guidelines state that only patients who decline surgery or who are unfit for surgery should be treated this way (7). In addition, a more recent individual patient meta-analysis of the randomised trial data, with longer follow-up, conducted by the Early Breast Cancer Trialists' group, demonstrated significantly improved long term (15 years) survival in surgically treated women (8).

Surgery for all older women is not appropriate and may cause harm if offered to the frailest and most comorbid older women. This was recently demonstrated by a recent study of outcomes of nursing home residents with breast cancer in the USA (9). These frail older women were all treated with surgery which resulted in significant morbidity and mortality as well as causing significant functional decline. Surgery may also have a negative impact on quality-of-life due to long term adverse events such as lymphoedema and chronic pain. Therefore in frailer older women, for whom life expectancy is limited, PET is potentially the better option. The issue is determining where this threshold sits.

In the UK there is considerable variation in the use of PET to treat women over 70 with operable breast cancer (10), with regional rates varying between 12 and 40% (11,12). A study using retrospective registry data has shown that case mix (variation in stage, health, fitness, deprivation

levels) does not account for all of this variation (13). This suggests that some of this variation is due to individual surgeon or patient preference. Patient preference for non-surgical therapy is often reported as a major factor in determining PET treatment in older patients (14). However previous studies examining this have suggested that lower rates of surgery in older patients are unlikely to be due to patient choice alone (15). Variation due to surgeon preference is substantial (16).

The treatment of older women with operable breast cancer may be considered a preference-sensitive healthcare decision and so it is important that shared decision-making be employed, with patients and healthcare professionals working together to determine the best treatment for that individual based on the clinical evidence and the patients' informed preferences (17-18). However, there is some evidence to suggest that not all older patients wish to engage in shared decision-making, preferring instead to simply receive information (19) and accept a doctor-led treatment decision (20-22).

The present study used prospectively collected detailed data from a large, multi-centre cohort study, which examined surgical treatment rates across UK hospitals in older women with operable, ER+ breast cancer (before and after adjustment for case-mix). We also investigated associations between treatment choice (surgery or PET) and patient decision-making style to determine whether patient preference was likely to be a significant factor in this variance.

Methods.

Regulatory approval.

Ethics approval and research governance approval was obtained (IRAS: 12 LO 1808). All patients gave written informed consent or consent was given by a proxy if the patient was cognitively impaired. The trial reporting followed the STROBE guidelines for reporting of observational studies (23).

Study Design:

A prospective, multicentre, comprehensive observational cohort study.

Sites:

Patients were recruited from 56 breast units in England and Wales (Supplemental Table ST1).

Supplemental Table ST1. List of recruiting sites

	Site Name	Local PI
1	Sheffield	Lynda Wyld and Matt Winter
2	Barnsley	Julia Dicks
3	Doncaster	Clare Rogers
4	Milton Keynes	Amanda Taylor
5	Scunthorpe and Grimsby	Rajesh Vijh (Scunthorpe), Jenny Smith (Grimsby)
6	Leicester	Monika Kaushik
7	Derby	Kwok Leung Cheung
8	East Lancashire	Julie Iddon
9	Harrogate	Matthew Adelekan
10	St Helens and Knowsley	Riccardo Audisio
11	York	Rana Nasr (York and Scarborough)
12	Liverpool	Chris Holcombe
13	Airedale	Claire Murphy
14	Leeds	Kieran Horgan
15	Bradford	Rick Linforth
16	Cardiff	Helen Sweetland

17	Aneurin Bevan Health Board	Simon Waters (Royal Gwent), Theresa Howe (Nevill Hall)
18	Royal Lancaster	Rishi Parmeshwar
19	Coventry	Abigail Tomlins
20	Grantham	Anzors Gvaramadze
21	Lincoln	Anzors Gvaramadze
22	Pilgrim	Anzors Gvaramadze
23	Hull	Peter Kneeshaw
24	Nottingham	Lisa Whisker
25	Southport	Anwar Haq
26	Leighton	Vanessa Pope
27	Royal Marsden	Jenny Rusby
28	Cheltenham General	Sarah Vestey
29	Guys and St Thomas	Michael Douek
30	Dorset County	Caroline Osborne
31	Mid Essex	Sascha Miles-Dua
32	Mid Yorkshire	Jay Naik
33	Bristol	Zoe Winters
34	Chesterfield	Iman Azmy
35	Rotherham	Inder Kumar
36	Darent Valley	Seema Seetharam
37	Kingston	Karyn Shenton
38	Colchester	Mukesh Mukesh
39	Yeovil	Caroline Osborne
40	Croydon	Sanjay Joshi
41	North Tees	Colm Hennessy
42	South Tees	Imtiaz Cheema
43	Luton and Dunstable	Mei-Lin Ah-See
44	Weston General	Rachel Ainsworth
45	Tameside	Stephanie Ridgway
46	Macclesfield	Lisa Barraclough
47	Wrightington, Wigan and Leigh	Angela Power
48	Birmingham	Fiona Hoar
49	Kings Mill	Rebecca Boulton
50	Wythenshawe	Nigel Bundred
51	Aintree	Peter Robson
52	Brighton	Gargi Patel
53	St Margaret's	Ashraf Patel
54	St Marys	Steve Parker
55	Oxford	Asha Adwani
56	Frimley and Wexham	Ruth Davis (Wexham), Raouf Daoud (Frimley)

Inclusion criteria:

Female patients ≥ 70 years of age. Primary operable invasive breast cancer (TNM stages: T1-4, N0-2, M0).

Exclusion criteria:

Disease unsuitable for surgery. Previous breast cancer within five years.

Baseline data collection:

Women were recruited at the time of breast cancer diagnosis and before treatment.

A baseline comprehensive geriatric assessment was performed using a range of validated tools with data collected on age, comorbidities (Charlson comorbidity index; CCI) (24), functional status (activities of daily living; ADL (25) and instrumental activities of daily living; IADL (26)), cognitive function (using the Mini Mental State Examination; MMSE (27)). Cognitive impairment was defined as a MMSE score < 24 , if they were consented by proxy or if dementia was identified on the CCI. Nutritional status was measured using the abridged patient generated subjective global assessment (aPBSGA) (28).

Baseline tumour characteristics were collected, including tumour size, biological subtype, grade and nodal status (both clinical, imaging and pathological status).

Patients' preferred and actual decision-making styles for their breast cancer treatment were also recorded using a validated questionnaire instrument (29,30). The questionnaire instrument uses a five point scale for both preferred and actual decision-making styles, ranging from the doctor making all decisions, through to the patient making the final decisions (see Supplemental Table ST2). The

decision-making preferences questionnaire was applied within 4 weeks of diagnosis and prior to treatment. Decision-making styles were then classified into one of three categories: Patient-centred, Shared and Doctor-centred (see Supplemental Table ST2).

Supplemental Table ST2: Classification of decision-making styles.

	Patient's referred decision-making style	Actual decision-making style	Decision-making Classification
1	I prefer to leave all decisions regarding my treatment to my doctor	My doctor made all the decisions regarding my treatment	Doctor-centred decision-making
2	I prefer that my doctor makes the final decision about which treatment will be used, but seriously considers my opinion	My doctor made the final decision about which treatment was used, but seriously considered my opinion	
3	I prefer that my doctor and I share responsibility for deciding which treatment is best for me	My doctor and I shared the responsibility for deciding which treatment was best for me	Shared decision-making
4	I prefer to make the final selection of my treatment after seriously considering my doctor's opinion	I made the final selection of my treatment after I had seriously considered my doctor's opinion	Patient-centred decision-making
5	I prefer to make the final selection about which treatment I will have	I made the final selection about which treatment I had	

Statistical analyses:

Primary treatment was dichotomised as surgery or PET. The proportion of patients undergoing surgery was calculated for each hospital.

Multivariable logistic regression was used to estimate the probability of a woman undergoing surgical treatment based on patient level factors, including age, Charlson co-morbidity index, activities of daily living (ADL), instrumental activities of daily living (IADL), Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status, tumour size and grade. Univariate models were first built including all variables and the model AIC values were used to determine which variables had most predictive importance. Multivariate models were then formed by adding variables in order of importance until the model AIC value ceased to improve. Further tests adding and removing individual covariates and comparing AIC led to a preferred model, which explained but did not over-fit the data. Missing data on disease characteristics and co-morbidity was handled using the method of multiple imputation by chained equations (MICE) (31) to produce 25 imputed data sets and combining the results (32).

Expected rates of surgical treatment were calculated for each hospital by summing the individual patient probabilities estimated from the logistic regression model. Risk adjusted rates of surgery were produced by dividing the observed rate by the expected rate for each clinician and hospital and multiplying this by the national rate (33).

Both unadjusted and adjusted rates of surgery at hospital level were displayed graphically as funnel plots to allow examination of the variability at each level and identification of outlying practice.

Funnel plots contain two limits; under the hypothesis that treatment choice is randomly determined and independent of clinician or hospital, 95% of units would be expected to lie within the inner limits (2 standard deviations from the mean) and 99% within the outer limits (3 standard deviations from the mean). Hospitals were said to have a Low Surgery rate if they lay below the 95% CI after

adjustment for case mix and High Surgery rate if they lay above the 95% CI after adjustment for case mix.

Concordance between preferred and actual decision-making preferences was assessed using Kappa and association between treatment, patient characteristics and decision-making style were identified using Chi-squared tests. Statistical significance was taken at $p < 0.05$.

Logistic regressions and multiple imputations were performed using the open source statistical programming language R (version 3.0.1), with the remaining data handling and analysis performed in Microsoft Excel for Windows 10.

Results.

Baseline Characteristics

A total of 3369 women with primary operable breast cancer were recruited to the study between 1st February 2013 and 6th June 2018. Of these, 60 patients received treatment that was not obviously primary surgery or PET or had inadequate recorded data to make an assessment on their treatment and were excluded from the analysis. A further 455 were excluded from the analysis due to having ER negative tumours or having insufficient data to draw conclusions about their ER status. The final population for analysis included 2854 patients with ER+ tumours, of whom 2354 were treated with Surgery and 500 treated with PET. See Supplemental Figure SF1 for study flow diagram.




Figure 1. Flow diagram for study.

The median age of surgical patients in the study was 76 years (range 70-95) and 84 years (70-102) for the PET patients. Baseline patient and tumour characteristics are shown in Supplemental Table ST3.

Supplemental Table ST3: Patient and tumour Characteristics According to Treatment Type

	Treatment Type		
	Surgery (n=2354)	PET (n=500)	Total (n=2854)
Age			
70-74 years	992 (42.1%)	52 (10.4%)	1044 (36.6%)
75-79 years	756 (32.1%)	79 (15.8%)	835 (29.3%)
80-84 years	424 (18.0%)	142 (28.4%)	566 (19.8%)
85+ years	182 (7.7%)	227 (45.4%)	409 (14.3%)
Missing	0	0	0
Cognition			
Normal	1399 (59.4%)	181 (36.2%)	1580 (55.4%)
Impaired*	232 (9.9%)	73 (14.6%)	305 (10.7%)
Missing	723 (30.7%)	246 (49.2%)	969 (34.0%)
Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI)			
3	891 (37.9%)	41 (8.2%)	932 (32.7%)
4	529 (22.5%)	87 (17.4%)	616 (21.6%)
5	457 (19.4%)	100 (20.0%)	557 (19.5%)
6+	396 (16.8%)	231 (46.2%)	627 (22.0%)
Missing	81 (3.4%)	41 (8.2%)	122 (4.3%)
ECOG Performance Status			
Fully Active (0)	1659 (70.5%)	137 (27.4%)	1796 (62.9%)
Restricted in strenuous activity (1)	481 (20.4%)	167 (33.4%)	648 (22.7%)
Fully ambulatory, capable of self-care (2)	68 (2.9%)	67 (13.4%)	135 (4.7%)
Capable of only limited self-care (3)	31 (1.3%)	75 (15.0%)	106 (3.7%)
Completely disabled (4)	1 (0.04%)	7 (1.4%)	8 (0.3%)
Missing	114 (4.8%)	47 (9.4%)	161 (5.6%)
Tumour size			
0-10mm	538 (22.9%)	50 (10.0%)	588 (20.6%)
11-20mm	971 (41.2%)	178 (35.6%)	1149 (40.3%)

21-30mm	527 (22.4%)	146 (29.2%)	673 (23.6%)
>30mm	282 (12.0%)	114 (22.8%)	396 (13.9%)
Missing	36 (1.5%)	12 (2.4%)	48 (1.7%)
HER2 status			
Negative	1640 (69.7%)	312 (62.4%)	1952 (68.4%)
Positive	202 (8.6%)	34 (6.8%)	236 (8.3%)
Inconclusive	70 (3.0%)	14 (2.8%)	84 (2.9%)
Missing	442 (18.8%)	140 (28.0%)	582 (20.4%)
Tumour Grade			
I	399 (16.9%)	98 (19.6%)	497 (17.4%)
II	1475 (62.7%)	329 (65.8%)	1804 (63.2%)
III	369 (15.7%)	57 (11.4%)	426 (14.9%)
Missing	111 (4.7%)	16 (3.2%)	127 (4.4%)
Pre-operative Lymph Node Status			
Negative	2022 (85.9%)	406 (81.2%)	2428 (85.1%)
Positive	325 (13.8%)	90 (18.0%)	415 (14.5%)
Missing	7 (0.3%)	4 (0.8%)	11 (0.4%)

*Impaired cognition = Mini Mental State Examination score <27, known dementia or consultee participant. CCI presented here includes age component.

Associations with treatment type

Table 4 shows the results of the multivariable logistic regression used in the adjustment model.

Table 4: Multivariate Logistic Regression Results (N= 2854)

	OR of having surgery	95% Confidence Intervals	P value
Age (per year above 70)	0.866	0.847 - 0.886	<0.001
ECOG PS 1* compared to PS 0	0.556	0.411 - 0.751	<0.001
ECOG PS 2* compared to PS 0	0.340	0.202 - 0.572	<0.001
ECOG PS 3* compared to PS 0	0.338	0.153 - 0.745	0.007
ECOG PS 4* compared to PS 0	0.294	0.023 - 3.699	0.343
IADL (per increase in score)	1.236	1.086 - 1.405	0.001
CCI (per increase in score)	0.824	0.758 - 0.892	<0.001
ADL (per increase in score)	1.087	0.992 - 1.191	0.072
Size (per mm)	0.988	0.979 - 0.997	0.007
Grade 2 (compared to Grade 1)	1.453	1.057 - 1.998	0.022
Grade 3 (compared to Grade 1)	2.607	1.665 - 4.081	<0.001
<p>*ECOG Performance Status 0: Fully active; ECOG Performance Status 1: Restricted in physically strenuous activities; ECOG Performance Status 2: Ambulatory and capable of all self-care; ECOG Performance Status 3: Capable of only limited self-care; ECOG Performance Status 4: Completely Disabled.</p> <p>OR = Odds Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval</p>			

Poorer performance status as assessed by the ECOG PS tool was associated with lower rates of surgical treatment. Higher rates of co-morbidity (as assessed by the CCI) and functional status (as

assessed by ADL and IADL) were associated with lower rates of surgical treatment. Larger tumour size was associated with lower surgery rates, whereas patients with grade 2 or 3 tumours were more likely to undergo surgery compared to those with grade 1 disease.


Rates of surgical treatment

The unadjusted rates of surgery varied substantially between the 56 hospitals (Figure 2(a)) ranging from 28.6 % to 100%, with 6 of 56 (10.7%) falling outside the outer 99% limits and 23 of 56 (41.1%) falling outside the inner 95% confidence limits on the funnel plots. The expected number falling outside this limit is by defined 1% and 5% respectively. Of the 23 outlying units, 10 had a higher than expected rate of surgery and 13 had a lower than expected rate of surgery (i.e. a higher rate of PET).


Taking account of patient level characteristics and adjusting for case mix (including patient age, ECOG performance status, Charlson Comorbidity Index, Activities of Daily Living, Instrumental Activities of Daily Living, tumour size, tumour grade) reduced, but did not eliminate, the variation in surgery rates between hospitals, with 5 of 56 (8.9%) still falling outside the 99% confidence limits and 10 of 56 (17.9%) falling outside the 95% limits on the funnel plot (Figure 2(b)). Of the 10 persistently outlying units at the 95% level, 2 had a higher than expected rate of surgery and 8 had a lower than expected rate of surgery (i.e. a higher rate of PET).

Figure 2: a) Unadjusted and b) adjusted rates of surgery across 56 UK breast units

a)



b)




Analysis of decision making styles

Of the study population, 2485/2854 (87.1%) patients had data available to analyse on decision-making preference, 2097 of these (84.4%) underwent surgery and 388 (15.6%) were treated with PET.

Patients preferred a doctor-centred decision-making style in 912 (36.7%), a shared decision-making style in 935 (37.6%) and a patient-centred decision-making style in 638 (25.7%). Patients rated their actual decision-making style as doctor-centred in 980 (39.4%), shared in 737 (29.7%) and patient-centred in 768 (30.9%). Agreement between preferred and actual decision-making style was 73.6% (Kappa = 0.60, $p < 0.001$; see figure 3).

Figure 3: Concordance between patients' preferred and actual decision-making styles.



Both preferred and actual decision-making styles were associated with final treatment type (see table 5).

Table 5: Patients' preferred and actual decision type according to treatment received.

Preferred decision type	Surgery (n=2097)	PET (n=388)	p	Actual decision type	Surgery (n=2097)	PET (n=388)	P
Doctor-centred	800 38.1%	112 28.9%	<0.001	Doctor-centred	872 41.6%	108 27.8%	<0.001
Shared	802 38.2%	133 34.3%		Shared	621 29.6%	116 29.9%	
Patient-centred	495 23.6%	143 36.9%		Patient-centred	604 28.8%	164 42.3%	

Patients treated with PET had significantly more patient-centred treatment decisions (42.3%) compared to shared (29.9%) or doctor-centred (27.8%); $p < 0.001$. Whereas patients who underwent surgery were more likely to have a doctor-centred (41.6%) treatment decision as opposed to shared (29.6%) or patient-centred (28.8%); $p < 0.001$ (table 5).

Older patients had a significantly higher preference for patient-centred decision making than younger patients and this was also reflected in the actual decision type, with the youngest cohort having much more doctor-centred treatment decisions (see table 6).

Table 6: Patients preferred and actual decision type by age category.

Age	70-74 (n=940)	75-79 (n=734)	80-84 (n=479)	85+ (n=332)	p-value
Preferred decision type					
Doctor-centred	358 (38.1%)	299 (40.7%)	163 (34.0%)	92 (27.7%)	<0.001
Shared	383 (40.7%)	267 (36.4%)	163 (34.0%)	122 (36.7%)	
Patient-centred	199 (21.2%)	168 (22.9%)	153 (31.9%)	118 (35.5%)	
Actual decision type					
Doctor-centred	418 (44.5%)	324 (44.1%)	154 (32.2%)	84 (25.3%)	<0.001
Shared	287 (30.5%)	194 (26.4%)	144 (30.1%)	112 (33.7%)	
Patient-centred	235 (25.0%)	216 (29.4%)	181 (37.8%)	136 (41.0%)	

Units that had a high rate of surgery (i.e. a rate higher than the upper 95% confidence limit), after adjustment for case mix, had significantly higher rates of doctor-centred actual decision-making styles (64.5% vs 30.6%; $p < 0.001$). Conversely, units with a low rate of surgery (i.e. a rate less than the lower 95% confidence limit) following adjustment for case mix, had significantly higher rates of patient-centred actual decision-making style (35.2% vs 11.8%; $p < 0.001$) (see table 7).

Table 7: Patients actual decision-making style by hospital surgery rate.

	Low Surgery Rate (n=216)	Average Surgery Rate (n=2100)	High Surgery Rate (n=169)	p-value
Doctor- centred	66 (30.6%)	805 (38.3%)	109 (64.5%)	<0.001
Shared	74 (34.3%)	623 (29.7%)	40 (23.7%)	
Patient- centred	76 (35.2%)	672 (32.0%)	20 (11.8%)	

Discussion.

In this large prospective cohort study of the treatment of older women breast cancer across 56 units in England, 17.5% (500/2854) of ER+ patients were treated with PET, which is lower than figures published by similar recent audits; most recently, the National Audit of Breast Cancer in Older Patients found that 24% of women aged 70+ years with early ER+ breast cancer were treated with PET between 2014 and 2017 (12). This may be because our study missed recruitment of some of the older, frailer cohort that would be more like to be treated in this way due to the requirement for consented enrolment. Comparison of the study data with UK national registry data age distribution in older cancer patients does show that this study slightly over recruited younger women (70-75) and under recruited older women, so the results may not be wholly representative of the picture across the UK (34).

The analysis demonstrates that increasing age at diagnosis is associated with a reduced likelihood of receiving surgical treatment which is consistent with other similar studies (1,15, 35-38). Higher levels of comorbidity and functional impairment (using ADL, IADL and ECOG performance status) were also associated with non-surgical treatment, which is again consistent with other published studies, where co-morbidity is often stated as a major reason for choosing PET over surgery (14, 39, 40). Tumour factors were also associated with treatment type, with larger tumours being less likely to be treated surgically which may represent patients and clinicians trying to avoid more major surgery, such as mastectomy and axillary node clearance. These results corroborate and update those found by our group in a registry study of 17 129 women aged 70 years and over between 2002 and 2010 (13).

There was considerable variation in the rates of surgical treatment across the 56 hospitals and, whilst this improved with case-mix adjustment, there was still considerable variation, with 17.9% of units remaining outside the 95% limits in funnel plot analysis. Two hospitals had significantly higher

and eight hospitals had significantly lower rates of surgery than could be explained by the case mix information available.

This persistence of variation in the treatment of older women with operable, ER+ breast cancer at hospital level is due to factors not included in the case-mix adjustment. One possible cause is clinician or patient preference for either treatment. These results clearly show that in units with higher rates of surgery, there was a significantly higher proportion of doctor-led decision-making styles and conversely, in units with higher rates of PET there were significantly more patient-led decision-making styles.

Treatment received was strongly correlated with decision-making style, with patients choosing PET having a higher rate of patient-centred decision-making styles compared to those treated surgically. This suggests that a significant proportion of women are choosing PET as a means of avoiding surgery. It also implies that those units with high surgery rates may be more strongly promoting surgery and not taking due consideration of the preferences of women themselves. What is interesting is that a UK survey found that most breast healthcare professionals had a strong view that, if given the choice between surgery and PET, most patients would favour surgery (41), which is not what our results would suggest. Indeed, patient preference for or refusal of surgery is also often stated a reason for treatment with PET (42), however Lavelle and colleagues found, in their cohort of 800 women over the age of 70, that lower rates of surgery among elderly patients are unlikely to be due to patient choice (15). Instead the observed variation may reflect clinician preference and how or whether alternative treatment options, such as PET, are presented at all, as was proposed by Hamaker and colleagues (43). Current guidelines on the use of PET in the older breast cancer population state it should only be used in patients with a short life expectancy (less than 2-3 years), or when significant comorbidities preclude surgery, or in patients who refuse surgery (44,45). It is left to the treating clinicians' judgement as to which patients should be offered PET as an alternative treatment option to surgery. Comprehensive geriatric assessment may have a role here to help

clinicians identify the patients more to benefit from being offered a choice and to support communication with patients (46).

Qualitative research in this older group of patients has suggested that they are more passive decision-makers, relying on the advice of healthcare professionals (20, 21, 47). However these results clearly show there are a significant proportion of older women who prefer a shared or patient-centred decision-making style, in particular in the oldest groups. Previous studies have examined the concordance between healthcare professional and patient preference for decision-making in breast cancer patients and found that their perceptions were often inconsistent with patient preference (19). Within this study, around three quarters of patients achieved their decision-making style, although this means a quarter did not, raising the possibility that they may be making choices which are not concordant with their treatment preferences. One of the factors which patients may prioritise highly in this age group is quality-of-life (48) and the maintenance of independence (20), both of which may be more highly preserved with PET than surgery (9), but valued less by clinicians who may innately prioritise survival metrics. In younger women the values of patients and clinicians are likely to be concordant but less so in older women. This may account for some of the discordancy observed in this study. There is also a possibility that some clinicians taking part may have adjusted their approach to information-giving in the study due to an awareness that information on decision-making was being collected.

Increasing age was associated with more patient-centred decision-making styles, both preferred and actual, which may partially explain the higher rates of PET in the oldest old. This may however be confounded by surgeons feeling more inclined to stress the importance of surgery in the youngest cohort, resulting in a perceived doctor-centred decision by patients in the younger group. Clinicians may also be aware that in the oldest and frailest women, treatment is unlikely to have a huge impact on survival as the majority of these women will die of non-breast cancer causes, so choice has less impact on survival.

This study has allowed us to collect large amounts of complex patient, tumour and treatment data on women with operable breast cancer from across the UK. Additionally, there were some issues with data completeness, with cognition and HER2 status subject to the most missing data. The well-established practice of imputation of data has therefore been used where it was deemed appropriate (49).

This study has identified outlying practice. This is important because patients who are treated with PET have been shown to have poorer outcomes compared to those treated with surgery (22, 50-53) but also overtreatment of frail older women who are unlikely to die of breast cancer regardless of treatment type may suffer unnecessary harms. Continuation of this variability in practice may result in a post-code lottery and further guidelines on the management of older women with operable breast cancer are needed. Having said that, these results do support the reports that some of the use of PET in the older breast cancer population may be due to patient choice which must be respected provided appropriate information is provided to patients to make an informed choice. There is evidence to suggest that older patients may prioritise quality-of-life over quantity (47,54), and clinicians should take this into account when counselling patients about treatment options. Shared decision-making suggests that patients should be informed of their treatment options (17) and for some older women it may be appropriate to offer PET as an alternative to 'standard' surgical treatment and allow the patient to decide what is best for them. Previous work by our group supports an individualised approach to treatment decision-making in this group (55) and consequently, we have recently developed, validated and trialled a decision aid to support decision making for older women facing the choice of surgery or PET (56-59). This tool is available on line at <https://agegap.shef.ac.uk/>. The tool displays health, age and fitness stratified survival outcomes for women over age 70 with early breast cancer according to whether they have surgery or PET. We hope to adapt this in the near future by adding stratified quality-of life and functional outcomes from treatment to ensure women get the information they need and value when making this choice. This may enable better evidence-based individualised decision-making and reduce variation.

References:

1. Lavelle K, Moran A, Howell A, Bundred N, Campbell M, Todd C. Older women with operable breast cancer are less likely to have surgery. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2007;94(10):1209-15.
2. Wyld L, Garg DK, Kumar ID, Brown H, Reed MW. Stage and treatment variation with age in postmenopausal women with breast cancer: compliance with guidelines. *Br J Cancer*. 2004;90(8):1486-91.
3. Derks MGM, Bastiaannet E, Kiderlen M, Hilling DE, Boelens PG, Walsh PM, et al. Variation in treatment and survival of older patients with non-metastatic breast cancer in five European countries: a population-based cohort study from the EURECCA Breast Cancer Group. *Br J Cancer*. 2018;119(1):121-9.
4. Jauhari Y GM MJ, Cromwell D, Horgan K, Dodwell D. National Audit of Breast Cancer in Older Patients Annual Report. Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership; 2018.
5. Morgan J, Wyld L, Collins K, Reed M. Surgery versus primary endocrine therapy for operable primary breast cancer in elderly women (70 years plus). *Cochrane database systematic reviews*. 2014;5:CD004272.
6. Chakrabarti J, Kenny F, Syed B, Robertson J, Blamey R, Cheung K. A randomised trial of mastectomy only versus tamoxifen for treating elderly patients with operable primary breast cancer-Final results at 20-year follow-up. *Critical Reviews in Oncology Hematology*. 2011;78(3):260-4.
7. Biganzoli L, Wildiers H, Oakman C, Marotti L, Loibl S, Kunkler I, et al. Management of elderly patients with breast cancer: updated recommendations of the International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) and European Society of Breast Cancer Specialists (EUSOMA). *Lancet Oncol*. 2012;13(4):148-60.
8. Gray R. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group analysis of surgery versus PET Unpublished data. 2019.
9. Tang V, Zhao S, Boscardin J, Sudore R, Covinsky K, Walter LC, *et al*. Functional Status and Survival After Breast Cancer Surgery in Nursing Home Residents. *JAMA Surg*. 2018 Dec 1; **153**: 1090.
10. Bates T, Evans T, Lagord C, Monypenny I, Kearins O, Lawrence G. A population based study of variations in operation rates for breast cancer, of comorbidity and prognosis at diagnosis: Failure to operate for early breast cancer in older women. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology*. 2014;40(10):1230-6.

11. BCCOM. Breast Cancer Clinical Outcome Measures (BCCOM) Project: Analysis of the management of symptomatic breast cancers diagnosed in 2004. 3rd Year Report December 2007. 2007.
12. National Audit of Breast Cancer in Older Patients. 2018 Annual Report.
<https://associationofbreastsurgery.org.uk/media/64447/nabcop-2018-annual-report.pdf>
(accessed 3 Jan 2019).
13. Morgan J RP, Ward S, Francis M, Lawrence G, Collins K, Reed M, Wyld L. Case mix does not fully explain variation in rates of non-surgical treatment of older women with operable breast cancer. *British Journal of Surgery*. 2015;102(9):1056-63
14. Wylie S, Ravichandran D. A UK national survey of breast surgeons on primary endocrine therapy of early operable breast cancer. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2013;95:353-6.
15. Lavelle K, Sowerbutts A, Bundred N, Pilling M, Degner L, Stockton C, et al. Is lack of surgery for older breast cancer patients in the UK explained by patient choice or poor health? A prospective cohort study. *British Journal of Cancer*. 2014;110:573-83.
16. Morgan JL, Walters SJ, Collins K, Robinson TG, Cheung KL, Audisio R, et al. What influences healthcare professionals' treatment preferences for older women with operable breast cancer? An application of the discrete choice experiment. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2017;43(7):1282-7.
17. Coulter A, Collins A. Making Shared Decision-Making a Reality: No Decision About me, Without me, The King's Fund: London, 2011.
18. GMC. Consent: patients and doctors making decisions together. General Medical Council: London, 2008.
19. Vogel BA, Helmes AW, Hasenburger A. Concordance between patients' desired and actual decision-making roles in breast cancer care. *Psycho-oncology* 2008;17(2):182–9.
20. Husain LS, Collins K, Reed M, Wyld L. Choices in cancer treatment: a qualitative study of the older women's (>70 years) perspective. *Psycho-Oncology* 2008;17(4):410–6.
21. Caldon L, Walters S, Reed M. Changing trends in the decision making preferences of women with early breast cancer. *Br J Surg* 2008;95(3):312–8.
22. Schonberg M, Marcantonio E, Li D, Silliman R, Ngo L, McCarthy E. Breast cancer among the oldest old: tumor characteristics, treatment choices, and survival. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28(12):2038–45.
23. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SL, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP; STROBE Initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

(STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet* 2007;370(9596):1453-7.

24. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis.* 1987; **40**: 373–383.
25. Mahoney F, Barthel D. Functional evaluation: The Barthel Index. *Md State Med J.* 1965 Feb; **14**: 61–65.
26. Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of Older People: Self-Maintaining and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living. *Gerontologist.* 1969 Sep 1; **9**: 179–186.
27. Folstein MF, Folstein SE, McHugh PR. "Mini-mental state". A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *J Psychiatr Res.* 1975 Nov; **12**: 189–198.
28. Vigano AL, di Tomasso J, Kilgour RD, Trutschnigg B, Lucar E, Morais JA, *et al.* The Abridged Patient-Generated Subjective Global Assessment Is a Useful Tool for Early Detection and Characterization of Cancer Cachexia. *J Acad Nutr Diet.* 2014 Jul; **114**: 1088–1098.
29. Strull W, Lo B, Charles G. Do patients want to participate in medical decision making? *Journal of the American Medical Association.* 1984;252:2990-4.
30. Sutherland H, Llewellyn-Thomas H, Lockwood G, Tritchler D, Till J. Cancer patients: their desire for information and participation in treatment decisions. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine.* 1989;82:260-3.
31. Su Y-S, Yajima M, Gelman AE, Hill J. Multiple Imputation with Diagnostics (mi) in R: Opening Windows into the Black Box. *Journal of Statistical Software.* 2011;45(2):1-31.
32. Rubin D. Multiple imputation from non-response in surveys. New York: J Wiley & Sons; 1987.
33. Spiegelhalter D. Funnel plots for comparing institutional performance. *Statistics in Medicine.* 2005;24:1185-202.
34. Todd A, Martin C, Morgan J, Herbert E, Burton M, Reed M, *et al.* Age specific recruitment and retention to a large multicentre observational breast cancer trial in older women: the Age Gap Trial. Submitted to *Journal of Geriatric Oncology* 2020.
35. Lavelle K, Todd C, Moran A, Howell A, Bundred N, Campbell M. Non-standard management of breast cancer increases with age in the UK: a population based cohort of women \geq 65 years. *British Journal of Cancer.* 2007;96(8):1197-203.
36. Ali A, Greenberg D, Wishart G, Pharoah P. Patient and tumour characteristics, management, and age-specific survival in women with breast cancer in the East of England. *British Journal of Cancer.* 2011;104(4):564-70.

37. Van de Water W, Markopoulos C, van de Velde C, Seynaeve C, Hasenburg A, Rea D, et al. Association between age at diagnosis and disease-specific mortality among postmenopausal women with hormone receptor-positive breast cancer. *JAMA*. 2012;307(6):590-7.
38. Bastiaannet E, Liefers G, de Craen A, Kuppen P, van de Water W, Portielje J-E, et al. Breast cancer in elderly compared to younger patients in the Netherlands: stage at diagnosis, treatment and survival in 127,805 unselected patients. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2010;124:801-7.
39. Balakrishnan A, Ravichandran D. Early operable breast cancer in elderly women treated with an aromatase inhibitor letrozole as sole therapy. *British Journal of Cancer*. 2011;105(12):1825-9.
40. Rao V, Jameel J, Mahapatra T, McManus P, Fox J, Drew P. Surgery Is Associated with Lower Morbidity and Longer Survival in Elderly Breast Cancer Patients over 80. *Breast J*. 2007;13(4):368-73.
41. Morgan JL, Collins K, Robinson TG, Cheung KL, Audisio R, Reed MW, et al. Healthcare professionals' preferences for surgery or primary endocrine therapy to treat older women with operable breast cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2015;41(9):1234-42.
42. Wink C, et al. Hormone treatment without surgery for patients aged 75 years or older with operable breast cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2012;19:1185-91.
43. Hamaker M, Bastiaannet E, Evers D, Van de Water W, Smorenburg C, Maartense E, et al. Omission of surgery in elderly patients with early stage breast cancer. *European Journal of Cancer*. 2013;49:545-52.
44. NICE. CG80 Early and locally advanced breast cancer: full guideline. <http://www.nice.org.uk/nicemedia/live/12132/43413/43413.pdf>; 2009 {accessed 7th May 2020}.
45. Audisio R, Pope D, Ramesh H, Gennari R, van Leeuwen B, West Cea. Shall we operate? Preoperative assessment in elderly cancer patients (PACE) can help. A SIOG surgical task force prospective study. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2008;65(2):156-63.
46. Mohile SG, Epstein RM, Hurria A, Heckler CE, Canin B, Culacova E, et al. Communication with older patients with cancer using geriatric assessment: a cluster-randomized clinical trial from the National Cancer Institute Community Oncology Research Program. *JAMA Oncology*. 2020;6(2):196-204.
47. Ekdahl A, Andersson L, Friedrichsen M. They do what they think is the best for me: Frail elderly patients' preferences for participation in their care during hospitalization. *Patient Education and Counselling*. 2010;80:233-40.

48. Shrestha A, Martin C, Burton M, Walters S, Collins K, Wyld L. Quality of life versus length of life considerations in cancer patients: A systematic literature review. *Psycho-oncology*. 2019;28:1367–80.
49. Buuren Sv, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. MICE: Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2011;45(3):1-67.
50. Van Leeuwen B, Rosenkranz K, Feng L, Bedrosian I, Hartmann K, Hunt K, et al. The effect of under-treatment of breast cancer in women 80 years of age and older. *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*. 2011;79:315-20.
51. Bouchardy C, Rapiti E, Fioretta G, Laissue P, Neyroud-Caspar I, Schafer P, et al. Undertreatment strongly decreases prognosis of breast cancer in elderly women. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2003;21(19):3580-7.
52. Bastiaannet E, Portielje J, van de Velde C, de Craen A, van der Velde S, Kuppen P, et al. Lack of Survival Gain for Elderly Women with Breast Cancer. *Oncologist*. 2011;16(4):415-23.
53. Wishart G, Greenberg D, Chou P, Brown C, Duffy S, Puroshotham A. Treatment and survival in breast cancer in the Eastern Region of England. *Ann Oncol*. 2010;21(2):291-6.
54. Meropol NJ, Egleston BL, Buzaglo JS, Benson AB, 3rd, Cegala DJ, Diefenbach MA, et al. Cancer patient preferences for quality and length of life. *Cancer*. 2008;113(12):3459-66.
55. Morgan J, Burton M, Collins K, Lifford KJ, Robinson TG, Cheung KL, et al. *Psycho-oncology*. 2015; 24: 1761-1766.
56. Ward SE, Richards PD, Morgan JL, Holmes GR, Broggio JW, Collins K, Reed MWR, Wyld L. Omission of surgery in older women with early breast cancer has an adverse impact on breast cancer-specific survival. *BJS* 2018; 105: 1454–1463.
57. Kate J Lifford, Adrian Edwards, Maria Burton, Helena Harder, Fiona Armitage, Jenna L Morgan, Lisa Caldon , Kirsty Balachandran Alistair Ring Karen Collins Malcolm Reed Lynda Wyld, Kate Brain. Efficient development and usability testing of decision support interventions for older women with breast cancer. *Patient Preference and Adherence* 2019;13 131–143.
58. Burton M, Collins KA, Lifford KJ, Brain K, Wyld L, Caldon L, Gath J, Revell D, Reed MW. The information and decision support needs of older women (>75 yrs) facing treatment choices for breast cancer: a qualitative study. *Psychooncology*. 2015 Aug;24(8):878-84.
59. Holmes G, Ward S, Morgan JL, Broggio JW, Collins K, Richards P, Reed MWR, Wyld L. Bridging the Age Gap A new prognostic model that predicts survival and aids in primary treatment decisions for older women with ER-positive early breast cancer. *BJS* in press 2020.

Appendix:

Co-authors – Bridging the Age Gap Trial Management Group members: Karen Collins⁸, Kate Lifford⁹, Adrian Edwards⁹, Kate Brain⁹, Alistair Ring¹⁰, Thomson Robinson¹¹, Tim Chater⁴, Kirsty Pemberton⁴, Anne Shrestha¹, Anthony Nettleship¹², Paul Richards², Annaliza Todd¹, Helena Harder³, Juliette Wright³, Richard Simcock³, Chris Murray⁹, Tracy Green¹³, Deirdre Revill¹³, Jacqui Gath¹³, Kieran Horgan¹⁴, Chris Holcombe¹⁵, Jay Naik¹⁶, Rishi Parmeshwar¹⁷

8. Department of Health and Social care, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield.

9. Division of Population Medicine, Cardiff University, 8th Floor, Neuadd Meirionnydd, Heath Park, Cardiff, CF14 4YS

10. Breast Unit, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust. Downs Road, Sutton, Surrey, SM2 5PT, UK.

11. Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Leicester, Cardiovascular Research

12. EpiGenesys, University of Sheffield, Floor C, Cathedral Court, 1 Vicar Lane, Sheffield, S1 2LT
Centre, Glenfield General Hospital, Leicester, LE3 9QP.

13. Members of the North Trent Consumer Research Panel (NTCRP),

14. Leeds General Infirmary, Great George Street, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS1 3EX, UK

15. Liverpool and broadgreen Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Thomas Drive, Liverpool, Merseyside, L14 3LB

16. Pinderfields Hospital, Mid Yorkshire NHS Foundation Trust, Aberford Rd, Wakefield, UK

17. Royal Lancashire Infirmary Ashton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 4RP, UK